

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks is requested. After entry of this reply, claims 1-17 are pending in the application. In this response and amendment, claims 1, 5, 8, 9, 10 and 11 are amended, claims 12-17 are added.

Please note and record the change of Attorney Docket Number in this matter to: 119645.00103.3.

In the office action dated June 15, 2006, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 5, 8, 9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement; rejects claims 1-4 and 8-11 under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Craig (U.S. Patent No. 6,108,687) in view of Fin (U.S. Patent No. 6,240,444); and rejects claims 5-7 under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Craig (U.S. Patent No. 6,108,687) in view of Fin (U.S. Patent No. 6,240,444), and further in view of Rutledge et al, "*Using Microsoft PowerPoint 2000*."

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 5, 8, 9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner characterizes these claims as containing subject matter not described in the specification in such a way to enable one skilled in the art to make or use the invention. Specifically, the Examiner believes that the specification fails to disclose the following claimed feature of the invention: "where said other computers and said leader computer each generally simultaneously display the text-based conferencing information without altering the information displayed in the shared web browser."

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection: the "without altering the information displayed in the shared web browser" feature is disclosed and enabled. Page 12, lines 1-14 of the

specification provide that a “white board” button 48 “invokes a shared web browser white board” allowing users to modify, draw, or annotate information being displayed collaboratively (page 12, lines 1-3). The white board is “invoked” by application of icon 48, separate from the shared web browser display. It is within the invoked white board that attendees add or annotate information interactively and in real-time for display in the shared web browser white board, separate from the shared web browser display. Additionally, a “chat” button 49 invokes a text based communication interface 83 (shown in Figure 5). This text based communication interface 83 is separate from the white board and the initial display within the shared web browser, providing “a ‘side bar’ to the presentation which is visible to each of the attendees” (page 12, lines 10 and 11).

Accordingly, the invoked white board and text based communication side bar window of the present invention allow all computers to generally simultaneously display the text-based conferencing information in a side bar window, and attendee annotations/comments in a white board, without altering the information displayed by the leader in the shared web browser. That is, the information displayed initially in the shared web browser, and in the invoked white board, is not altered by additionally displaying the text-based conferencing information in a side bar window. Although Applicant respectfully traverses the §112, first paragraph, rejection, Applicant nonetheless amends the claims to more specifically articulate these features of the claimed invention to avoid a possible mistaken interpretation.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The Examiner rejects claims 1-4 and 8-11 under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Craig (U.S. Patent No. 6,108,687) in view of Fin (U.S. Patent No. 6,240,444); and rejects claims 5-7 under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Craig (U.S. Patent No. 6,108,687) in view of Fin

(U.S. Patent No. 6,240,444), and further in view of Rutledge et al, "*Using Microsoft PowerPoint 2000.*" Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's §103(a) rejections.

A rejection under §103 requires a showing of all of the following: 1) there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify or combine the references as suggested by the Examiner (it is not sufficient to say that the cited reference can be modified or combined without a teaching in the prior art to suggest the desirability of the modification; 2) there must also be a reasonable expectation of success; and 3) the references must teach or suggest all limitations of the claims. The teaching or suggestion to combine or modify the applied art and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not in applicant's specification (MPEP § 2143).

The combination of references cited does not teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations. Further, the references do not provide a suggestion or motivation to modify or combine the references as suggested by the Examiner.

The Examiner, in the office action dated November 3, 2005, at page 10 and 11, in response to previously entered Applicant argument that the cited references (specifically Fin) do not disclose a shared web browser white board and interactive text conferencing, responded that a shared web browser white board and text conferencing are "taught in Figures 2, 4 and 13 of Fin." Specifically [the Examiner responded], "the figures illustrate collaborative web browsing between a customer and a bank agent. The illustrate window is interpreted as a white board that allows interactive text messaging."

Accordingly, if the illustrate window in Fin is interpreted as a white board allowing interactive text messaging, then the text messaging of Fin is displayed within or on the white board. So, in Fin, any interactive text messaging between the users during and about the

presentation (display) on the white board would necessarily alter the ongoing display on the white board. The present invention features computers each simultaneously displaying the text-based conferencing information in a shared web browser side bar window separate from the white board to not alter the information displayed in the shared web browser white board. For at least this reason, Fin and the other cited references do not disclose, teach or suggest all of the claimed recitations.

Regarding independent claim 5, as amended, the prior art fails to disclose, teach or suggest initiating a collaborative presentation by a leader, from a leader's computer, to a plurality of participants' computers, where the computer of each of the participants generally simultaneously displays the information on the leader's computer, where the participants collectively surf through the Internet according to web sites selected by the leader on the leader's computer, and the leader can designate one of the participants as a new leader, so that a presentation of information, or a selection of a web site, on the new leader's computer causes the information presented, or web site selected, on the new leader's computer to be generally simultaneously displayed on the computer of each of the other participants.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicant submits that the pending claims distinguish over the prior art, and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the 35 USC §103 rejections.

Claims Added by this Response and Amendment

Claims 12-17 are added by this response and amendment to more completely cover certain aspects of applicant's invention. All added claims are dependent upon either independent claim 1 or 5, and respectively recite additional elements patentable over the prior art of record,

elements providing presenters and users with advantages and efficiencies over the prior art in view of the shared web browser interactivity capabilities detailed above.

The recitation of claims 12-17 find support throughout the specification and drawings, and particularly in portions of the specification including, but not limited to, the following:

claim 12 - page 10, lines 13-18;

claim 13 - page 10, lines 19-23;

claim 14 - page 10, lines 9-11;

claim 15 - page 10, line 23 through page 11, line 3;


claim 16 - page 11, lines 3-5; and

claim 17 - page 11, lines 6-7.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that pending claims 1-17 are allowable, that the application is in condition for allowance, and requests that the Examiner issue an early notice of allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney in the event that a telephone interview will advance prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Bruce D. George
Registration No. 43,631

Date: December 13, 2006

Blank Rome LLP
One Logan Square
18th & Cherry Streets
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215-569-5798